DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 268 687 EA 018 433

AUTHOR Greene, Myrna; Lahti, Mel
TITLE A Study of Teachers Who Leave the Teaching Profession.
PUB DATE Jun 84
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Society for the Study of Education (Guelph, Ontario, Canada, June 1984).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Career Change; Career Choice; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Labor Turnover; Predictor Variables; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Education; *Teacher Persistence
IDENTIFIERS Canada; University of Lethbridge (Canada)

ABSTRACT

A 1983 survey of graduates with bachelor's degrees in education from the University of Lethbridge in Canada indicated that almost 3 in 10 had left or never entered the teaching profession. This pilot study examined test and questionnaire response data for 177 former students out of 1,809 who had received a B.Ed. degree since 1972. Of these respondents, 21 submitted to telephone interviews including questions concerning attitudes toward career success. The researchers used statistical analysis to seek variables discriminating between teachers and non-teachers. Of those teaching, 78 percent planned to continue teaching. Half of the non-teachers indicated interest in returning to teaching. The findings suggested that women were more likely to leave teaching temporarily but that neither sex was more likely to leave permanently. The reasons for leaving did differ by sex: women cited staying home and men cited career or job changes as major reasons. The academic abilities of teachers and non-teachers were similar. Personality characteristics accounted for only a small percentage of the variance between the groups. Measures of attitudes toward career success showed the teachers more concerned with salaries and autonomy and less with personal satisfaction and opportunities for advancement than non-teachers. (PGD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Myrna S. Greene

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED268687

A STUDY OF TEACHERS WHO LEAVE THE TEACHING PROFESSION

by

Myrna Greene
Faculty of Education, The University of Lethbridge

Mel Lahti
Hamilton Junior High School, Lethbridge

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the
Canadian Society for the Study of Education
Guelph, Ontario, June, 1984

EA 018 433

A STUDY OF TEACHERS WHO LEAVE THE TEACHING PROFESSION

A major concern of teacher education institutions and of the teaching profession is the number of teachers who are leaving teaching. Of even greater concern is the allegation that "often the best ones drop out most rapidly, leaving a disproportionate number of the less able to fill the ranks of those who become career teachers" (Bush, 1970, p.112). A number of reasons have been suggested for the large teacher turnover. Some of these include teacher workload, the decision-making apparatus, teacher status, and inappropriate preparation of teachers. Wayne McGuire, the President-elect of the National Education Association (NEA) in 1979, stated that "literally thousands of teachers are leaving the profession as victims of 'teacher burn-out'" (McNergney & Carrier, 1981, p.30). However, there is very little research to support any of these suggestions.

If large numbers of teachers are leaving teaching there are serious implications for the teaching profession and for teacher education. As Cory (1970) states: "No occupational group can hope to attain recognition as a profession if a relatively large number of its practitioners are transients who do not look upon their work as a career" (p.1). Perhaps the education teachers receive in their university programs ill prepares them for the realities of teaching; perhaps it prepares them very well for careers other than teaching. In

any case, if teacher education institutions are to adequately prepare effective teachers who will continue in a teaching career, and if the teaching profession is to attract persons who will become career teachers, it is important to discover why teachers are leaving the profession and whether there are differences in situational, personal, academic, and program characteristics of those who become career teachers and those who leave the profession. Such information could become invaluable in the guidance and selection of teacher education candidates, in developing teacher education programs, and in improving the "holding power" of the teaching profession.

RELATED RESEARCH

The 1981 NEA Study of American Public School Teachers discovered that 12% of the 1326 currently practising teachers who responded to the survey indicated that they "certainly would not become a teacher again" (p.73); another 24% "probably would not". In the 1983 NEA Teachers' Opinion Poll (1983, Note 1) the "probably would not" figure had risen to 29%. These figures have shown a substantial increase in the last 20 years from 7.9% of the 1961 sample who "probably would not", and 2.8% who "certainly would not" choose a teaching career again. Nor do the figures take into account those who presumably felt strongly enough to have already left teaching. The largest increase in

percentage of those who would not return to teaching has occurred among males, among teachers 30 years older and among secondary teachers. However, only 8% of the sample indicated that they definitely planned to leave teaching just as soon as they could. These figures probably reflect the economic conditions, suggesting perhaps that a number of teachers would like to leave the profession but are unable or unwilling to risk finding another job. Masland and Williams (1983) state that studies "indicate that 90% of teacher graduates who are not teaching have opted out of the field because they did not want to teach, not because of an unfavorable job market" (p.6).

Canadian figures (Gillis, Note 2) indicate that between the 1980-81 and 1981-82 school years, 2338 teachers left teaching in Alberta, representing 10.3% of the teaching force. This figure compares with a national (excluding Quebec) leaving rate of 7.7% in that same period. However, a 1982 study by the Alberta Teachers' Association (ATA), (Note 3) concludes that the Statistics Canada figure "must be carefully interpreted since a high percentage of leaving teachers' departures are temporary rather than permanent" (p.9).

In a doctoral dissertation on early teacher attrition Vandehey (1981) studied teachers in Oregon who left the profession from 1976 to 1978 with five years of experience

or less. She found that although

> 70% of the former teachers in the study had intended, upon receiving their degrees, to teach five or more years. . . only one-fourth of them did teach five years before leaving the profession. . . One-third more women than expected left the secondary level; and twice as many women as expected left the smallest districts. . . One-third of the men identified 'administration and/or supervision' as the factor most influencing their decisions to leave (p.1384-1).

However, Mark and Anderson (1978) found in a study of the survival behavior of entrants to the teaching profession for the St. Louis metropolitan area between 1968 and 1975, that the proportion surviving beyond one year increased from 6.7% for the 1968 entrants to 83.6% for the 1973 entrants. They also found that the differential between the relative survival rates of men and women had decreased over time. Based on these findings the authors concluded that the "problem" of teacher retention may have adopted a new appearance, that "too many teachers remain in the active force whereas only 10 years ago conventional wisdom held that many teachers did not remain active long enough" (p.382).

In the Spring of 1982, the ATA distributed questionnaires to 2966 Alberta teachers who were leaving their school staffs for reasons other than transfer; 743 questionnaires (25%) were returned. Interviews were held with 26 of the 743 respondents. Although no figures are

included about the proportion of the teaching force this number represents, the findings indicated that in relation to the Alberta teaching force as a whole, proportionately more females left teaching than males, more single than married teachers, more teachers in the 25 to 36 year age group, more of those with two to nine years of teaching experience, and more of those with fewer than four years or with seven years of teacher education.

Although not so stated in the study, it appears that only 734 of the 743 respondents gave a reason for leaving the profession. It is also possible that some of the categories were overlapping so the interpretations of the data provided cannot be made with certainty. But it appears that of those 734 respondents, 544 (78%) left voluntarily for reasons other than automatic retirement, termination of contract or to teach elsewhere. Of those 544, the major reasons they left were for maternity or home reasons (23.9%), spouse accepting another position (17.8%), to attend university (18.4%), for another occupation (12.3%), travel, health or early retirement (15.1%), to move to another community (6.2%) or for other reasons (11.6%). Those who left teaching for voluntary reasons indicated a variety of factors affecting their decisions to leave, most of which were "school-based".

In a rather disturbing longitudinal study of North

Carolina teachers (Schlechty & Vance, 1981) the authors examined the career histories of teachers who scored high or low on existing standardized measures of academic ability. One of their most significant conclusions was that "there is a strong negative relationship between measured academic ability and retention in teaching" (p.110). Although the data are limited to one state and to a period of seven years, and although many criticisms have been levelled against the measures of academic ability, the findings suggest that further research is critical.

In another article Schlechty and Vance (1983) reviewed several research studies on the issue of teacher retention. They cited Pavalko, who concluded that "although teachers are recruited disproportionately from girls of higher measured intelligence, it is those of lower measured intelligence who continue working" (p.473). Similarly, Sharp and Hirshfield, found that "for males and females combined, those with the shortest commitment to teaching as a career had the largest proportion high on the academic index" (in Schlechty & Vance, 1983, p.473). The authors suggest that the ways in which schools are managed and organized may create situations which cannot attract or maintain the best people available.

Chapman and Hutcheson (1982) state that previous research shows that one out of every four teachers

eventually changes to another career, but that there is very little research which examines differences in the characteristics of those who leave and those who stay. Their study of 690 Indiana teachers indicated that differences were not explained by sex, race, age, or educational institution, but that teachers and non-teachers differed significantly in their self-rated skills and abilities and in the importance they assigned to select criteria of success. Those who left teaching assigned greater importance to job autonomy and salary increases, while those who stayed assigned more importance to recognition by other people.

Chapman (1983) suggests that the research on the influences on teacher retention has not been cumulative in its impact and that models or theories are required to explain teachers' decisions to leave or remain in teaching. He classifies the previous research into four areas - personal characteristics, teacher training and early teaching experience, professional and social integration into teaching, and career satisfaction. He concludes that the research on sex suggests that women teachers tend to leave the profession earlier than men teachers and that sex interacts with other variables to affect decisions; that teachers of higher socioeconomic status are more likely to leave; that there is little relationship between educational attainment and occupational mobility of teachers; that there

are mixed results about the effect of teacher education programs and first teaching experiences; that those who stay in teaching value social integration; and that career satisfaction is important, especially as it mediates other factors. Finally, Chapman proposes a model of the influences associated with teacher attrition which takes into account

> (a) the personal characteristics of the teacher, (b) the nature of teacher training, and early teaching experience, (c) the degree to which the teacher is socially and professionally integrated into the teaching profession, (d) the satisfaction teachers derive from their career, and (e) the external environmental influences impinging on the teachers' career (p.47).

PURPOSES OF THIS STUDY

This was a pilot study on the graduates of one teacher education program. It was intended to determine whether a larger study on a more diverse sample of teachers would be worthwhile.

This study had three main purposes:

1. to examine the employment history of University of Lethbridge B.Ed. graduates
   a. to determine the proportion of graduates who have left teaching
   b. to examine career plans of teaching and non-teaching graduates
   c. to examine graduates' perception of the usefulness of their B.Ed. program in their present jobs

2. to determine reasons why some graduates are not teaching, and

3. to compare teaching and non-teaching graduates with respect to

   a. personal and academic characteristics

   b. perceptions about importance of various items in judging career success.

METHODOLOGY

The study was conducted in three phases, which corresponded to the three major objectives of the study. The first objective, examining the employment of B.Ed. graduates and determining the proportion who are not teaching, was addressed primarily by means of a survey. Data from the surveys as well as from follow-up telephone interviews, were used to examine the second objective--examining reasons why some graduates had left teaching. To compare the characteristics and perceptions of teaching graduates with those of non-teaching graduates, data from the QAULTEP data bank[1] were added to the data obtained from the survey and the interviews. This data bank contains demographic and biographic information, scores on a number of standardized personality and psychological tests, and a

---

[1] QAULTEP is an acronym for Qualitative Analysis of the University of Lethbridge Teacher Education Program (for further information, see Dravland & Greene, 1979).

variety of program information such as courses, grades, practicum ratings, and so on, collected during the graduates' B.Ed. program.

The Sample

In the fall of 1983 questionnaires were mailed to 311 University of Lethbridge B.Ed. graduates, representing 17% of the 1809 students who had received a B.Ed. degree since 1972 (The University of Lethbridge Annual Reports, 1972-1982). The sample was selected to include all B.Ed. graduates from Samples 2 and 3 of the QAULTEP data bank. The implication of that selection process is that those selected for this study would have graduated after 1972 and before 1983, would have the most complete data in the QAULTEP bank--including complete program data and scores on most of the psychological/personality tests, and would be eligible to teach in any of Grades K through 12 in the public and separate schools of Alberta.

Addresses for the graduates were provided by the University of Lethbridge Alumni Association. Since some of these addresses had not been updated recently, 33 questionnaires were returned with address unknown or having been received by the wrong person, resulting in an actual sample of 278 graduates, of which 152 (55%) were female and 126 (45%) were male. Completed questionnaires were received from 177 (64%) of that sample. Fifty-four percent of the

respondents were female; 46% were male. Eighty-nine percent of the respondents were younger than 35 years of age; only 3% were older than 45. This was not unexpected given that 75% of the respondents had received their B.Ed. degrees after 1975.

Interview Sample

Survey respondents were asked whether they would be willing to participate in a follow-up telephone interview. In all, 138 respondents (78%) said "yes" and provided a phone number; 103 of those were teaching or substitute teaching and 35 were not. A random selection from both groups of graduates was phoned (11 teaching and 10 not). Non-teachers were over-represented in the telephone interviews since the second objective of the study focussed primarily on those who were not teaching.

Analysis

Much of the analysis was descriptive in nature. A variety of statistical tests (e.g. Chi-square and t-test) were used to test for the significance of differences between the groups of teachers and non-teachers, on various characteristics. In addition discriminant analyses was used to determine which combination of variables best discriminated between the teaching and non-teaching groups. Variables were allowed to enter in a stepwise fashion with an F to enter $\geq$ 1.00. Cases with missing data were excluded

from the analysis. Since multiple regression is analogous to discriminant analysis in the case where the dependent variable consists of one dichotomous variable, and since multiple regression is somewhat easier to interpret, this procedure was also used to determine which variables could best predict group membership.

RESULTS

For the purposes of this study, teaching graduates were those who were employed by a school system, whether private, public or separate. The few respondents who were vice-principals or principals were considered to be teaching because most of them clearly retained some teaching responsibilities. Of the 177 respondents, 117 (66%) had a regular teaching appointment within a school system. Another nine graduates (5%) were substitute teaching on a casual basis but clearly planned to return to more regular appointments. These were also classified as teaching graduates, making the total number of those continuing to teach, 126 or 71% of the total sample.

Non-teaching graduates included 39 (22%) who were not employed in any capacity relating to teaching, plus the 12 respondents (7%) who considered themselves to be in positions "related to teaching" but who were not employed by school districts. These positions included tutoring or teaching music in their homes, teaching adult sessional

courses, working in libraries, and instructing or assisting at a college or university. Thus there were 51 respondents, or 29% of the total sample, who were considered to have left the teaching profession.

The distribution of these groups by sex and age is illustrated in Table 1. The relationship between sex and whether currently teaching or not was not significant. However, proportionately more females than males had left the teaching profession at some time and then returned; $x^2 = 7.45$ (df = 1, N =171); $p = .006$. Just over one-third of the women had left teaching and returned, compared with only 17% of the men. The primary reasons given for leaving the profession and then returning were, for females; family and children (19), "needed a break" (5) relocation (4), study (3) and miscellaneous other reasons such as travel, retraining and "not suited to teaching". The majority of the females had been out of teaching for one or two years (M = 2.1 years; SD = 1.8). Male teachers' reasons for leaving and then returning included study (4), being "fed up" (4), retraining (2), and a variety of other reasons such as "no job on return from Africa". Again, most were out of teaching two years or less (M = 1.5 years; SD = 7.1).

Table 1

Percentages of B.Ed. Graduates Teaching and Not Teaching by Various Characteristics (N=177).

Characteristics	Teaching		Not Teaching	
	N	%	N	%
Total Respondents	126	71.2	51	28.8
Sex - female	68	54.0	27	52.9
- male	58	46.0	24	47.1
Age - 25-35	112	88.9	44	86.3
- 36-45	11	8.7	3	5.9
- >45	3	2.4	2	3.9
Left teaching and returned				
- female	20	15.9	14	27.5
- male	9	7.1	18	35.3

Characteristics of Teaching Graduates

Those who were currently teaching were asked to complete Section 2 of the questionnaire; those who were not were asked to skip Section 2 and go on to Section 3. The 117 graduates clearly employed in a teaching capacity completed Section 2, as did six of the nine teachers who were substitute teaching and seven of the 12 graduates who were in non-teaching positions. This discussion refers to those 126 graduates who were employed by a school system, of

whom 123 completed Section 2.

Since the primary purpose of this study focussed on non-teaching graduates, Section 2 of the questionnaire asked simply about the teachers' further education and career plans. Fifty-eight (47%) of the 123 teaching graduates who completed Section 2 had completed some formal education beyond the B.Ed. degree; 20 had taken courses toward or had completed a diploma in education; seven had, or were working toward, a Master's degree, 14 had another baccalaureate degree, and 17 had taken a variety of miscellaneous courses.

With respect to their career plans, 91 (78%) said they planned to make a career of teaching. Eighteen percent said they would prefer to leave; eight of those planned to leave in the near future, 11 said their long-range plans did not include teaching, and the other three indicated that they would prefer to leave but were unwilling or unable to do so. The remaining four teachers were uncertain about their future plans.

Non-Teaching Graduates

The following discussion pertains to the 51 graduates (29% of the respondents) who were not employed in a teaching capacity, 44 of whom completed Section 3 of the questionnaire. Thirty (68%) of this group had taught at some time since receiving their B.Ed. degrees--18 in a regular classroom setting, the remainder in special

education, family life and so on. The average number of years those 30 teachers were employed was 3.97 years (SD =1.86).

Reasons for Not Teaching. The non-teaching graduates were asked to rank a list of reasons why they weren't teaching, from most to least important. These responses are shown in Table 2. Since the reasons for males and females not to teach are often quite different, the rankings have been separated by sex. For women the major reason was staying home with family, with 16 of the 19 women who answered the question ranking it first. "No job" received six second choices. For men, the major reason was "changed job or career", which received seven first and five second choices. "Frustration", and "no advancement" also received a number of choices.

Table 2

Teachers' Reasons for Leaving Teaching: Ranking of First to Fourth Choices by Sex (N = 44)*

Reason		Number of Choices 1st	2nd	3rd	4th	M	SD
Home	M	2	-	-	-	1.00	.00
	F	16	1	1	-	1.17	.51
No job	M	3	1	1	-	1.00	.89
	F	2	6	-	-	1.75	.46
School	M	-	1	2	1	3.00	.82
	F	2	-	-	-	1.00	.00
Other job	M	7	5	-	-	1.42	.52
	F	2	1	-	-	1.33	.58
Frustration with teaching	M	3	1	1	1	2.00	1.26
	F	-	2	3	-	2.60	.55
No advancement opportunities	M	-	2	2	2	3.00	.89
	F	-	1	-	-	2.00	.00
Other	M	4	-	3	1	2.25	1.49
	F	2	3	-	-	1.60	.55

*Males = 20; Females = 24.

Employment of Non-Teaching Graduates. Just over one-half of the 44 non-teaching respondents who completed Section 3 were employed outside their homes. Their jobs were very varied--carpenter, electrician, computer analyst, bookkeeper, several who were self-employed, and others. However a much higher proportion of males (80%) were employed than females

(33%); $x^2 = 7.79$ (df = 1, N = 44): $p = .005$. About one-half of those employed (47%) indicated that their B.Ed. degrees had helped to prepare them for their present position; 12 said it had been very helpful; 10 said somewhat helpful. Six others said it had not helped at all. The ways listed in which a B.Ed. degree had been helpful included such things as "helped with human relationship skills", "made me more literate", "got me the job", "useful in raising children", and so on.

Twenty-three of the non-teachers who completed the question would consider returning to classroom teaching; nine of those would like to return "as soon as possible"; the remainder would return if the "right" job came up. Twelve of the groups said they would definitely never return to the classroom, and 11 were undecided. Again, there was a significant difference between males and females - $x^2 = 4.85$ (df = 1, N = 42); $p = .03$. A large percentage of females were planning to return to teaching when their children were older. Two categories of comments were written by those who said they would not return to the classroom--those referring to satisfaction with their present job and being no longer interested in teaching, and those who were disillusioned with teaching. Their comments included "life is too short"; "teaching is too disheartening", or "there's too much hassle and no support from parents".

Comparison of Teaching and Non-Teaching Graduates

This portion of the study was addressed in two stages. The first utilized the data in the QAULTEP data bank (personality and academic characteristics collected at the time of admission to the B.Ed. program); the second is based on the 21 follow-up telephone interviews.

Academic and Personality Characteristics. The variables available in the QAULTEP data bank relevant to academic qualifications were grade point average at admission to the B.Ed. program and at termination, and scores on the English competence test required for admission to the program. T-tests on the two GPA measures and the English competence scores indicated that there was no difference in the academic qualifications of the teachers and non-teachers. Nor was there any difference relative to sex or age.

Personality measures included scores on the California Psychological Inventory (Gough, 1957), the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire (Cattell & Eber, 1962), a Dogmatism scale, a Q-sort measure of self-concept, and a measure of authoritarianism.[2] Both multiple regression and

---

[2] These tests were administered when students applied for admission to the Faculty of Education and were used only for research purposes and not for guidance or selection.

discriminant analysis procedures were used to attempt to predict group membership (teaching and non-teaching) on the basis of the various personality factors. The two procedures produced essentially identical solutions but each facilitated the interpretations of the other. Three separate analyses were run; one with the 16PF variables, one with the 18 subscales of the CPI, and one with the remaining variables (academic variables, D-scale, Q-sort and F-scale). This latter group did not differentiate between the two groups in the discriminant analysis and accounted for a negligible amount of the variance on the regression analysis.

Only four of the 16PF variables entered the discriminant analysis (N = 159) producing a canonical correlation of .247 which was not significant. Similarly, these five variables entered the regression analysis, accounting for only 6% of the variance.

Six of the CPI variables entered the discriminant analysis (N = 157) resulting in a canonical correlation of .347; $x^2 = 19.49$ (df = 6); $p = .003$. The resulting 3.419 F value in the multiple regression analysis was also significant (df = 6, 150) at the .05 level. However, even though these results are statistically significant, these six variables account for only 12% of the variance and only 66% of the cases were correctly classified. The results of

the discriminant analysis are shown in Table 4. The resulting function was defined primarily by tolerance, capacity for status and sense of well being.

Table 4

Summary of Discriminant Analysis of the CPI Subscales for Teachers and Non-Teachers (N = 157)

Step	Variables	Significance Level	Discriminant Function Coefficient
1	Tolerance	NS	-.889
2	Capacity for Status	.011	.949
3	Sense of well being	.004	.709
4	Social pressure	.002	-.581
5	Femininity	.003	.364
6	Responsibility	.003	-.398

Group Centroids = -.236 for teachers and
.571 for non-teachers

Perceptions of Career Success

Chapman and Hutcheson (1982) had discovered differences in teachers and non-teachers' perceptions of the importance of various criteria in judging success in a career. The 21 interviewed participants were asked to respond to eight of the 11 criteria used by Chapman and Hutcheson, rating their importance on a 1 to 5 scale. These eight criteria were then submitted to a discriminant analysis and multiple regression to determine which, if any, of the criteria would best predict group membership. Four of the eight criteria yielded a canonical correlation of .65 ($p < .05$). The resulting function was defined primarily by salary and autonomy (see Table 5). In both cases teachers attached more importance to the criterion than did non-teachers. Teachers attached less importance to personal satisfaction and opportunity for advancement. These same four variables entered the multiple regression analysis and produced a multiple R of .65, accounting for 43% of the variance in the dependent variable (group membership). The resulting 3.00 F value was not significant, however (α (4,16) = 3.01). In both the discriminant and multiple regression analyses, 81% of the 21 cases were correctly classified using the four variables.

Table 5

Summary of Discriminant Analyses of Teachers and Non-Teachers' Ratings of Items of Importance in Judging Career Success (N = 21)

Step	Variable	Significance Level	Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficient
1	Personal satisfaction	NS	-.453
2	Autonomy	.05	.767
3	Salary	.04	.714
4	Advancement	.05	-.560

Criteria not included
Chance to contribute to important decisions
Recognition by peers
Approval of family and/or friends
Status or prestige

Group centroids = - .786 for teachers and
.864 for non-teachers.

Interviewed graduates were asked if they had it to do over, if they would get a B.Ed. degree. Fourteen of the 21 teachers (67%) said yes, but understandably, there was a significant relationship between those who said yes, and whether or not they were teaching; $x^2 = 4.03$ (df = 1, N = 21); $p = .04$. All but one of those currently teaching would do it again, but only four of the 10 non-teachers would. This is consistent with the survey results in which

approximately one-half of the non-teaching respondents indicated that their B.Ed. degrees had been helpful in some way.

DISCUSSION

Although this was clearly a pilot study and was conducted on the graduates of only one institution, some of the findings appear worthy of further study. First, 29% of the sample of graduates from 1972 to 1982 had left (or never entered) the teaching profession. That figure is consistent with those cited in some studies (Chartres, 1970; Mark & Anderson, 1978), but considerably higher than the 10% cited by Statistics Canada for Alberta teachers in 1981. In addition to those who left, 23% of those currently teaching planned or would prefer to leave teaching, or were uncertain about whether or not they wished to stay. On the other hand almost one-half of those who were not teaching said they would or might return to teaching under certain circumstances. These findings appear to reflect a career-transient society, as much as they do an exit from the teaching profession, and they strengthen recent arguments for a life-long learning model of teacher education.

The education degree was perceived to be important even by many of those who had left teaching; several indicated that it had helped to provide discipline, thinking skills,

or personal relationship skills. Those who would not get a B.Ed. degree again if they had it to do over indicated that it was too theoretical, too stressful, too limiting or too hard on their self-concept.

The findings of this study support research which discounts the rather persistent view that women are more likely to leave the teaching profession than men. As Mark and Anderson (1978) indicated, the differential in survival rate in males and females appears to be decreasing over time. The results of this study suggest that women are more likely to step out of teaching for a time and then return, but there was no relationship between the respondents' sex and whether or not they were currently teaching. However, reasons for leaving the profession did tend to differ by sex. The majority of women had left for home and family reasons and many of them planned to return to teaching. Men's reasons for leaving were less clear and the male respondents listed more reasons overall. No job, other job, frustration with teaching, and no advancement were frequent reasons for men to leave teaching, and in all likelihood there was considerable interaction among those reasons.

These differences between male and female reasons for leaving, and their career plans require further study. Chapman and Lowther (1981) conclude that women are more content with teaching, and one might easily reach the

conclusion that this is in part because of the relative compatibility it offers with family life, and that women are therefore less concerned about advancement opportunities and the various frustrations in teaching than are men. However, even if these interpretations are correct for this sample, southern Alberta, with its agricultural base, conservative history and large Mormon population may not be representative of the larger population. There is also some evidence that women put more effort into their classroom teaching and men put more effort into advancing up the career ladder. Greene (1984) found a significant difference between the professional development activities of males and females, and Schlechty and Vance (1983) suggest that females largely dominate staff development in schools, but that "those who run staff development seldom run the schools" (p.480). They suggest further that nurturance and growth are highly valued in the classrooms. These characteristics are typically associated with women. Thus there is obviously a need for much more research in this area.

There was no difference between teachers and non-teachers with respect to academic abilities as measured by GPA and English competence. This result is not consistent with those reported by Schlechty and Vance but is not surprising for this sample. Candidates for the B.Ed. program are carefully screened; they all follow similar programs, and they meet relatively high academic standards

to pass their practicums. Thus the sample for this study was a homogeneous group which is unlikely to be highly differentiated on academic characteristics.

It appears that it may be possible to discriminate between teaching and non-teaching graduates on the basis of certain personality characteristics. Of all the personality measures analyzed only the CPI scores produced significant results, and even then accounted for only a small percentage of the variance. Because of this and because the mean differences on each variable were not statistically significant, it is misleading to attempt to interpret results. However, it is very tempting to do so. Of the three variables entering the discriminant and regression analyses first, those who stayed in teaching tended to score higher than non-teachers on tolerance, and lower on capacity for status. These interpretations must be made with extreme caution but they are consistent with the other results.

Some very tentative interpretations might be made about the difference between teachers and non-teachers' perceptions of the importance of various items in judging career success. It appears that a combination of ratings of the importance of salary, autonomy, opportunity for advancement and personal satisfaction was able to discriminate betwen the two groups. Teachers attached less importance to personal satisfaction and opportunities for

advancement, but more to salary and autonomy. These findings at first appear to contradict those of Chapman and Hutcheson who found that those who had left attached more importance to salary and autonomy. However, southern Alberta teachers are well paid compared to their American colleagues, relative to other jobs and professions, so this discrepancy is not entirely contradictory. Also, in this study the questions were being asked during an interview, which may have elicited different responses. For example, it seemed part way through the interviews that the teaching respondents might be interpreting autonomy to mean freedom to make the decisions within their own classroom. Also, the current economic conditions may have had an influence on responses to these type of questions. Nevertheless, this interpretation has resulted from a very small sample and should not be considered definitive.

Summary

It would appear from the results of this study that it would indeed be worthwhile to further refine the research questions and extend the study sample. There is some indication that relatively large numbers of teachers leave the profession, that the reasons for leaving differ significantly between males and females, and that those who leave and those who stay differ on some personality traits and in their perceptions of what constitutes career success. Clearly, further research is required.

REFERENCES

Bush, R.N. (1970). The status of career teachers: Its effects upon the teacher dropout problem. In T.M. Stinnett (Ed.), The teacher dropout. Itasca, IL: F.E. Peacock.

Cattell, R.B. & Eber, H.W. (1962). Manual for forms A and B, Sixteen personality factor questionnaire. Champaign, IL: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing.

Chapman, D.W. (1983). A model of the influences on teacher retention. Journal of Teacher Education. 34(5), 43-49.

Chapman, D.W. & Hutcheson, S.M. (1982). Attrition from teaching careers: A dicriminant analysis. American Educational Research Journal, 19(1), 93-105.

Chapman, D.W. & Lowther, M. (1982). Teachers' satisfaction with teaching. Journal of Educational Research, 75, 241-247.

Chartres, W. (1970). Some factors affecting teacher survival in school districts. American Educational Research Journal, 7, 1-27.

Corey, A.F. (1970). Overview of factors affecting the holding power of the teaching profession. In T.M. Stinnett (Ed), The teacher dropout. Itasca, IL: F.E. Peacock.

Dravland, V. & Greene, M.L. (1979, April). Development of a model for the evaluation of teacher education programs. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Gough, H.G. (1957). Manual for the California psychological inventory (CPI). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Greene, M.L. (1984). The professional development activities of southern Alberta teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation.

Mark, J.H. & Anderson, B.D. (1978). Teacher survival rates - a current look. American Educational Research Journal, 15(3), 379-383.

Masland, S.W. & Williams, T.T. (1983). Teacher surplus and shortage: Getting ready to accept responsibilities. Journal of Teacher Education. 34(4), 6-9.

McNergney, R.F. & Carrier, C.A. (1981). Teacher development. New York: Macmillan.

Schlechty, P.C.& Vance, V.S. (1983). Recruitment, selection, & retention: The shape of the teaching force. The Elementary School Journal, 83(4), 469-487.

Schlechty, P.C. & Vance, V.S. (1981). Do academically able teachers leave education? The North Carolina case. Phi Delta Kappan, 63(2), 106-112.

Status of the American public school teacher 1980-1981. (1981). National Education Association Research Report, Washington, D.C.

Vandehey, T.L. (1981). Early teacher attrition: Background data and professional concerns of teachers who leave the profession. (Doctorial dissertation, Oregon State University, 1981). Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, 1384-A.

REFERENCE NOTES

1) Teachers uncertain about wisdom of their career choice. (1983, July). In Report on Education Research.

2) Gillis, G. (1983, September 21). Telephone conversation quoting Statistics Canada figures.

3) Results of the 1982 survey of teachers terminating employment with present board or taking leave of absence. (1982). Unpublished report of the Alberta Teachers' Association, Edmonton, ALTA.